



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

History of the Theory of Sovereignty Since Rousseau. By C. E. MERRIAM, JR., Ph. D. Pp. x, 232. Price, \$1.50. The Columbia University Press: Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, Vol. XII, No. 4. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1900.

A "History of the Theory of Sovereignty Since Rousseau," is the work of a graduate student in the Columbia University School of Political Science. One cannot but admire the courage of the author in undertaking a task so great and at the same time so delicately critical. In view of the fact that he had to pursue his study without a satisfactory system of political philosophy, afforded by recent writers or constructed by himself, Dr. Merriam's monograph is certainly a meritorious production. Its publication will help to arouse a greater interest in the purely theoretical aspects of political science.

Woodrow Wilson once said, in speaking of sovereignty, that "no man who cares a whit about his standing among students of law or politics can afford to approach it lightly." This implied warning to students of political science not to commit themselves, without due deliberation, to a theory of sovereignty did not embarrass Dr. Merriam, since nowhere in his monograph does he propose to take an independent stand on the problems of political philosophy—least of all, on the problem of sovereignty. Nowhere does he criticise or expound the theories since Rousseau, with a view to arriving at a solution of the important but vexing problem of sovereignty. Nowhere does he attempt to indicate the true doctrine. His is rather the task of the annalist, the recorder, the illustrator, the historian. The product of his work is "a historical study" in which it is deemed "sufficient to indicate the various ways in which the subject of sovereignty is approached, and to emphasize the importance of knowing the path that is followed by each school of theorists." Dr. Merriam is content with presenting "illustrations of the various concepts of sovereignty, and their frequent confusion." "The dogmatist," he says, "should show which is the proper point of view."

In the quotations just given is disclosed a weak point in the monograph. For history without interpretation is meaningless. And is it not true that before one is able to discuss to advantage the theories of others, one must himself have taken an independent stand on the problems under consideration? Nor is he who takes such a stand and asserts that *this* or *that* is the proper view necessarily a "dogmatist." For even in this "inductive age" one may philosophize without dogmatism.

Dr. Merriam introduces his study of the history of the theory of sovereignty since Rousseau with a brief sketch of the theory prior to the period that is especially considered. The classical basis of the

theory of sovereignty is found in Aristotle's Politics. The Roman concept is expressed in the sentence, "The will of the prince has the force of law, since the people have transferred to him all their right and power." While the ruling theory of the Middle Ages is summed up as "government based on the consent of the governed." Bodin was the first to treat the subject systematically. Then came Althusius, Hobbes, Puffendorf, Locke, and Rousseau.

General characteristics of the theories of sovereignty leading up to and including the philosophy of Rousseau are: First the individualistic—contractualistic tendency; second, a movement towards the absolutist conception of sovereignty; and third, a failure to recognize "the unity and personality of state."

The period since Rousseau is viewed by the author as a period of reaction against the Revolutionary doctrine of popular sovereignty. The first attack was made by the so-called historical school. Kant and his school opposed the Revolutionary theory. Hegel represented the opposition from a different standpoint. The theory of Divine Right was fostered. The patrimonial theory was revived. The several lines of assault all seem "to converge at one point, namely, the proposition that the state was the result of a contract deliberately made by individuals." The theory of popular sovereignty was generally denied.

The later chapters of the monograph deal with "Popular and State Sovereignty," "The Austinian Theory," "Sovereignty and the American Union," and "Federalism and Continental Theory."

BENJ. F. SHAMBAUGH.

The State University of Iowa.

The City for the People. By Professor FRANK PARSONS. Pp. 597. Paper, 50 cents. Published by Dr. C. F. Taylor, 1520 Chestnut street, Philadelphia, 1900.

According to the publisher, Dr. Taylor, this valuable work grew out of the desire to present what legal rights the cities of the various states of this country enjoyed in the ownership and operation of public utilities.

In the third chapter of the book, embracing eighty pages, and in an appendix of nearly twenty pages more, is given the best summary extant on this subject. If any one desires to learn the rights of cities in California, Washington, Minnesota or Missouri to draw up their own charters and determine the powers of the city government, or if one desires to know the use that San Francisco and other cities have made of these powers, or what places in other parts of the country enjoy the right to own and operate street railways or gas works or